

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 08/18/2004

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/028,768	12/28/2001	Gee Sung Chae	2658-0281P	4297
2292 75	590 08/18/2004		EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEV	VART KOLASCH &	RICHARDS, N DREW		
PO BOX 747				
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•		2815	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	10/028,768	CHAE, GEE SUNG	
, arios, y, tolioli	Examiner	Art Unit	_
	N. Drew Richards	2815	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 28 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appears amination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applic) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper rep ch places the applic	ply to a cation in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data are been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 7 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three most parned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate ext the final Office action; or	tension fee under (2) as set forth in
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF 			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) M they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search ((see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or s	simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ns.
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	· · · ——		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely file	d amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because: Se		sidered but does NO	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	re newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-8,21-26</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. \square The drawing correction filed on is a) \square app	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).		_
10.▼ Other: See continuation sheet			·Nomo
	TO Supervisa Techness		R

Application No.

Applicant(s)

Application No.

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Each independent claim, namely claims 1, 5 and 23, include a newly presented limitation of the first metal layer being patterned by dry etching using the second metal layer as a mask so that etched side-walls of the first metal layer and the second metal layer are substantially aligned. This limitation is a newly presented limitation that requires further search and consideration.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant has argued that the Final Rejection was premature because it introduced a new ground of objection. Applicant argues that this new ground of objection is tantamount to a rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph and thus the rejection should hot have been final. This is not persuasive. The claim in issue, claim 5 is believed to be definite and thus was objected to, not rejected. Any amendment to correct the deficiencies outlined in the objection could have been made without affecting the scope of the invention of touching on the merits of the claim. Thus, the finality is considered proper and maintained..

With regard to the art rejections of the claims applicant presents arguments traversing the use of applicant's "conventional" figures 2, 4A and 4B. Applicant argues that the examiner has not met the burden of establishing a prima facie case that the figures are prior art. These figures have been treated as admitted prior art. The figures are labeled "conventional" and are discussed in the "background of the invention" section of the application. Labeling the figures as "conventional" and discussing them in the "background" is considered sufficient evidence that these figures are prior art. In support of this we need look no further than the definition of "conventional" and "background". According to Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, tenth edition, "conventional" means "2 a: according with, sanctioned by, or based on convention; b: lacking originality or individuality; c: ordinary, commonplace; 3 b: of traditional design." "Background" is defined as "b (1): the circumstances or events antecedent to a phenomenon or development." Thus, labeling the figure as "conventional" and discussing the figures in the "background" sufficient evidence has been presented that the figures are indeed prior art to the applicant's invention and the examiner's initial burden has been met.

Continuation of 10. Other: If applicant timely presents an amendment solely directed to correcting the objections of claim 5, such amendment will be entered as a matter of form to reduce or simplify the issues for appeal.